



Land Use Committee

Minutes

Wednesday, March 21, 2018

9:00 a.m.

DuPage County Conference Room
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois

Members Present: Mark VanKerkhoff (Co-Chair), Michael Horsting (for Heather Mullins, Co-Chair), Drew Awsumb, Dionne Baux, Judy Beck, Allison Buchwach, Thomas Chefalo (for Eric Waggoner), Colin Duesing, Khurshid Hoda, Paul Hoss, Arnold Randall, Paul Rickelman, Heather Smith, Andrew Szwak, Nathaniel Werner, Nancy Williamson, Ruth Wuorenma, Angela Zubko.

Members Absent: Matthew Asselmeier, Susan Campbell, Kristi DeLaurentiis, Lisa DiChiera, Johanna Leonard, Dennis Sandquist.

Staff Present: Stephen Ostrander (committee liaison), Nora Beck, Austen Edwards, Patrick Day, Lindsay Hollander, Kristin Ihnchak, Erin Kenney, Martin Menninger, Jason Navota, Elizabeth Scott, Jeff Schnobrich.

Others Present: Julius Christian (affiliation unknown).

1.0 Call to Order

Mark VanKerkhoff called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

There were no agenda changes.

Co-Chair Mark VanKerkhoff noted the great attendance at the meeting and thanked committee members.

It was also announced that it was the last meeting for longtime committee member Than Werner, who would be retiring from his position as Planning & Zoning Administrator for the City of Elmhurst. Than related his future plans, and Mark and Committee Liaison Stephen Ostrander both led the committee in thanking Than for his many years of service to the committee and CMAP, and wishing him the best in his upcoming retirement.

3.0 Approval of Land Use Committee meeting minutes of February 21, 2018

Mark VanKerkhoff indicated one correction that needed to be made to the Land Use Committee meeting minutes of February 21, 2018, (this correction was made following the meeting, and the revised minutes were posted on March 22). A motion to approve the corrected minutes was then made by Paul Rickelman and seconded by Ruth Wuorenma; all in favor, the motion carried.

There was a related question about why Land Use Committee minutes usually do not identify which committee member asked a question or made a comment. Committee Liaison Stephen Ostrander explained that this was an intentional decision made by him and former Committee Chair Ed Paesel in response to concerns of misquoting committee members commenting on highly controversial topics, as well as a related interest in promoting candid, open discussion at committee meetings.

Stephen also explained that he typically will only identify the committee member in the minutes if their comment (a) is appropriate for inclusion in the minutes and (b) specifically references work or matters relevant to their municipality, county, organization, etc.

4.0 ON TO 2050: Draft Governance Chapter – Lindsay Hollander and Patrick Day, CMAP

CMAP staff have developed the draft ON TO 2050 chapter addressing governance. Lindsay and Patrick reviewed the chapter recommendations, underlying strategies, and selected action steps to achieve those recommendations.

Thomas Chefalo noted that, in the chapter about annexation, Lake County staff would suggest the addition of “where appropriate.”

A committee member asked if it was possible for CMAP (perhaps through the LTA program) could assist communities with matters related to performance management (through training, software, etc.). Patrick responded that supplemental staffing is an area that CMAP is looking to help with (through trainings, etc., to get them up to speed).

Another member noted that she was struck by the mention of “a modern Census,” given that Illinois stands to lose two House seats (due to population loss), and thought that perhaps the Census needs more emphasis in the plan—and for the region.

A member asked for more information on the Chicago Regional Growth Corporation (CRGC), which was mentioned in the presentation. Mark VanKerkhoff responded that he was on the CRGC Board, and would be glad to provide more information. (Simone Weil of CMAP also followed up later with the committee member to provide more information).

Another member commented that she would prefer the term “data-informed,” rather than “data driven,” because she felt that “data driven” can miss opportunities and the greater context. Lindsay Hollander responded that she agreed.

A member said that she thought that this draft chapter was one of the best put together documents from CMAP. Given that there might be elected officials reading this, she thought that links might be important and the document would benefit from more examples.

Another member asked if the chapter would go into detail about “aggregated data” and who might be responsible for that. Lindsay responded that CMAP has not fully fleshed what specific data would be included.

A member commented that on the topic of annexation, “there might be times where it isn’t the right thing to do.” Lindsay responded that CMAP will have to clarify that the plan’s focus is on patches (for example, around Cook County), not outer rural areas. This same member also mentioned that the idea of a VMT-based fee might be controversial.

Another member suggested that maybe the key is a great big marketing plan, especially given that our region is in competition with other regions such as Los Angeles.

A member noted a need to identify funding solutions for communities that are experiencing transportation demands such as trucks passing through their communities (en route to destinations in other communities).

Another member suggested that there is a need to develop a predictive tool that gives an idea of both the short and long term costs of new developments. He thought that perhaps this could be the focus of an LTA or similar CMAP initiative.

5.0 ON TO 2050: Draft Environment Chapter – Nora Beck, Kristin Ihnchak, and Jason Navota, CMAP

Staff have also developed an initial draft of the major recommendations of the ON TO 2050 chapter addressing the environment. Nora and Kristin reviewed the recommendations, underlying strategies, and selected action steps to achieve those recommendations (as summarized in [this memo](#)).

One committee member underscored the need to focus on the role and relevance of watersheds.

Another member recommended that key natural agricultural areas be added as systems.

A member thought there needed to be more recognition that addressing climate change also offers opportunities (including some job pathways).

Another member noted that it was important to not put together natural areas and agricultural easements in the same sentence, especially as agricultural easements are private.

A member noted that she had been intrigued by the possibility that fresh water will be something that attracts people to the region (as compared to, say, California). Similarly, people coming to the region following natural disasters elsewhere (e.g. from Puerto Rico following Hurricane Maria). She thought that perhaps the plan should somehow reference this issue.

Another member stated that she thought it was important that the plan acknowledge that we are not certain about climate change and its effects—especially “we don’t know what we don’t know.”

A member reiterated her opinion, previously-stated in past committee meetings, that MWRD should be represented on the Land Use Committee. Nora Beck, who serves as Committee Liaison to the Environment Committee, noted that MWRD was represented on that committee.

Another member suggested that CMAP needs to have a transitional plan (dependent on local revenue), but “that’s not going to be enough” without additional federal and state funding. He also mentioned that the region is overbuilt, and open space can’t just be the place where water gets dumped.

A member noted that water conservation is important. It’s also important to understand what species are actually in our streams, etc.

Another member recommended more focus on overarching ecosystem connectivity and co-benefits.

A member said that there is a need to find a way to communicate these issues to lay people—and connect it to their core concerns.

Another member said that the region needs to underscore that we have fresh water—a competitive advantage. She mentioned that some people have suggested that our region should call itself “The Fresh Coast.”

A member noted that in the municipality he works for they are 80% built out, and yet he expects pressures for development and redevelopment to continue. He added that MPC is looking at ways developments and municipalities can pursue strategies related to water retention and trade. Nora responded that the chapter includes discussion of strategies such as this.

Another member commented that he had heard some concern that some of the

GO TO 2040 goals were being lost. Therefore, there is a need to identify connections (i.e. how 2050 recommendations relate to GO TO 2040 recs). He also said that the way some of the plan text is written, it doesn't seem to sufficiently acknowledge what municipalities and counties are already doing. Last, he seconded the notion that there is some uncertainty (and "we don't know what we don't know"), and therefore some language in the chapter should be "tempered."

6.0 ON TO 2050: Layers Approach Update – Lindsay Bayley, CMAP

In developing ON TO 2050, CMAP aims to provide actionable guidance for local implementers of policy recommendations. CMAP developed the place-based layers approach to deliver contextual data on how strategies relate to local communities. Lindsay briefly updated the committee on the layers approach and gave more information on the data layers that most directly relate to land use.

There were no questions.

7.0 ON TO 2050: Disinvestment Layer – Erin Kenney, CMAP

Erin presented an overview of areas in the region experiencing disinvestment. In contrast to the population-based Economically Disconnected Areas (EDAs), the disinvested areas layer was developed using nonresidential elements of market activity. This layer expands on the findings from the Reinvestment and Infill strategy paper and Infill and TOD snapshot, and it will serve as an input to the ON TO 2050 layers.

One member asked for clarification, particularly how the topic of race was included. Erin explained that the disinvestment layer doesn't directly concern people and demographics—rather, it is focused on location of development, etc.

Another member suggested that there might be a need to better acknowledge assets in these areas, because there is a need for a rational argument to soften the message, recognizing that many of these communities were established because of unique assets.

A member agreed, but added that there is a need to acknowledge that there were policies (especially in that past) that furthered disinvestment. Another member seconded this, suggesting mapping past red-lining.

Another member added that perhaps there was need to unpack what are the reasons that these areas have not recovered—and how to target them for help and assistance.

A member noted that there was need to explain how areas were selected, because he saw an area in his county that didn't make sense.

Another member said she would like to see the included maps superimposed on other maps showing different kinds of assets, such as wetlands, etc.

8.0 Other Business

There was no other business.

9.0 Public Comment

There was no public comment.

10.0 Next Meeting

The committee was scheduled to meet next on April 18, 2018.

11.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:04 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen Ostrander, LUC Committee Liaison
April 13, 2018